

Memory over Forgetting: Monuments, Memorials, and Intangible Heritage

*Bonita Bennett, Bonny Ibhawoh, Alex Lichtenstein,
and Daniel J. Walkowitz*

This issue of *Radical History Review* follows in the long wake of the Black Lives Matter movement, Rhodes Must Fall in South Africa and the United Kingdom, and ongoing controversies over US Confederate monuments that reverberated worldwide.¹ These closely related and even mimetic events of the past decade, and many others like them, bespeak a particularly contentious moment in the global history of monuments and memorials. They also reflect and are in dialogue with a half century of historical interest in monument making and unmaking, much of it congruent with the history of *RHR* itself.

On the heels of the emergent, bottom-up social history of the 1960s and 1970s in the academic sphere and the closely allied social justice movements of that same tumultuous era, public history emerged along with contested memorialization from below (through the mobilization of community activists) and from above (largely by state actors). For example, activists in New York's Chinatown created the Museum of Chinese in America in 1982, and six years later, the Tenement Museum opened in the East Village, both dedicated to publicly and accessibly centering the experiences of immigrants and ethnic communities in the American master narrative. When the architect Maya Lin designed the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, installed on the National Mall in 1982, she deftly incorporated this new concern with celebrating "ordinary heroes" while eschewing the grand monumentality characterizing most

Radical History Review

Issue 152 (May 2025) DOI 10.1215/01636545-11610010

© 2025 by MARHO: The Radical Historians' Organization, Inc.



SHOUT
SHARE IT

such monuments found in the nation's capital. Her controversial, nonrepresentational design, however, almost immediately met with loud objections as some veterans' groups reasserted the traditional and long-standing ideal of monuments to political leaders and soldiers who gave their lives in war. The result was a supplementary memorial, *The Three Servicemen*, a sculpture placed in 1984 close to Lin's grave-like wall already inscribed with 58,000 names of the dead and missing (of course, to see a memorial to the millions of Vietnamese dead, one would have to travel to Hanoi). As the official memorial website delicately puts it even now, "In January 1982, the decision was made to add a flagstaff and sculpture on the Memorial site in order to provide a realistic depiction of three Vietnam servicemen and a symbol of their courage and devotion to their country."² Like this counter-memorial to Lin's original design, such traditional monuments tend to be large stone, bronze, or concrete structures, usually tablets and/or figurative displays that uncritically heroize their subjects. Perhaps the most well-known site for such memorialization in the United States is the National Mall, long famous for the Jefferson, Washington, and Lincoln Memorials. The two decades after the much-heralded and yet controversial building of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial witnessed the installation there of more traditional memorials to veterans of the Korean War and World War II, as well as additional celebrations of political figures, notably Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Martin Luther King, Jr.

No less important to the current moment is the abiding form of the grand monuments that still loom over our collective public square and the meanings such imperious structures seek to impart. Wars and politicians evoke both dissent and support; people have foibles; armed conflict on behalf of the nation entails difficult military, ethical, and personal decisions, and can lead to atrocities by the victors as well as the vanquished.³ Traditional monuments materialize their subjects in heroic form to celebrate, not to evaluate or criticize. Impenetrable material begets impenetrable meanings. Such monuments are not porous; they resist interrogation and interpretation. Thus a monument fixed in steel, concrete, bronze, or stone cannot make room for discussion of such fraught subjects as the My Lai massacre, the Enola Gay's dropping of the atomic bomb, or the impact of war on civilian populations. Like memory generally, such monuments implicitly—and sometimes explicitly—obscure, ignore, or blur important debates or nuances in the event or person memorialized. In the worst sense, they recapitulate what James Young reminds us was the genre of fascist monumentalism.⁴ These monuments can in fact become celebrations of what now might be called toxic masculinity and jingoistic nationalism, in which unquestioned authority is invested in great men and "our boys" protecting the home front.

Prefiguring more recent activist interventions against monuments that celebrate slaveholding regimes, the revolutionary events of 1989 to 1992 in the USSR and the Eastern Bloc and, later, in South Africa, inaugurated a new wave of monument activism that sought less to build new memorial structures than to tear down

these symbols of the ancien régime. The often somewhat spontaneous actions from below saw protesters seeking to redress prevailing memory narratives of what they regarded as discredited social orders by toppling statues of figures such as Lenin and Stalin and, in 2015 South Africa, of the imperialist Cecil Rhodes.⁵ The iconic image of US soldiers abetting Iraqis in pulling down the Saddam Hussein monument in Baghdad in 2003 (the US military's institutional action in this instance might complicate notions of popular activism and agency) suggests the enduring trope of what some South African activists would subsequently describe as “fallism” (as in “Rhodes Must Fall”). That particular mobilization by students at the University of Cape Town gave impetus to the broad student decolonial movement in South Africa and elsewhere, leading to “Fees Must Fall” and other initiatives using the “Must Fall” hashtag.

The upheavals of 1989 to 1991 and the newfound public legitimacy of knocking over once revered statues has reopened questions of what constitutes a monument and queried the memory work that such public installations claim to enact, questions that continue to animate scholars and the public alike. The articles and essays in this issue, traversing a wide terrain of memory interventions, illustrate something of the intellectual and political ferment that has accompanied the new “memory activism.” The issue also continues a long history of *RHR*'s engagement with these matters and public history more generally.

Public history has long been part of *RHR*'s remit. Long before the historical profession at large recognized the problematic manner in which history was being served up to the public in vernacular form—whether in textbooks, monuments, memorials, museums, historical sites, popular culture, roadside attractions, or even theme parks—the *RHR* collective regarded this emergent field as a crucial terrain of seeking a more democratic “people's history.” The editors of issue 25, all the way back in 1981, observed that “the oppositional uses made of history by subordinate classes and nationalities . . . have generally been ignored by the American historical profession.” The global cultural and political upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s, however, everywhere shifted the way history was understood, practiced, and taught in the subsequent era of Reagan and Thatcher, Botha and Brezhnev. That 1981 *RHR* issue, the editors proposed, helped initiate “an ongoing effort to report on, learn from, and assess the diverse products of this burgeoning ‘peoples’ history’ movement.”⁶

The lead article in that issue, penned by the oral and labor historian Michael Frisch, pointed out that “there has been an exponential increase in the number of people involved in what is coming to be called Public History,” defined most broadly as “new kinds of historical products, generally meant for various public audiences rather than the usual circle of professional academic specialists.”⁷ Frisch himself regarded as essential what he elsewhere called the “shared authority” that might be embodied in such projects, as professional historians joined forces with

mobilized activist groups on the ground—especially women, minorities, and working people—to reclaim a more inclusive historical narrative and to conduct reparative memory work, often but not always through oral history projects. The Museum of Chinese in America and the Tenement Museum surely embody this notion of shared authority. But the movement was worldwide, ranging from the founding of the post-apartheid District Six Museum in Cape Town by local anti-apartheid activists seeking to reclaim a neighborhood subjected to fifteen years of “forced removals,” to a public art project lining a half mile of the culvert of a tributary of the Los Angeles River in the San Fernando Valley, Judith Baca’s *Great Wall of Los Angeles*. That riverbed mural, designed and painted collectively by a group of young Chicana/o artists in conjunction with at-risk youth, community members, and scholars, narrated a people’s history of California from the genocide of Indigenous peoples in the Spanish mission era through the Watts uprising of 1965. In its “ability to depict contested histories and historical struggles,” Baca’s public mural project represents a striking instance of the confluence of “people’s history” and what is today called “memory activism” rooted in polyvocal community participation, as does the District Six Museum.⁸ In the latter instance, a social movement dedicated itself to preserving the remaining memoryscape of the decimated neighborhood in anticipation of apartheid’s demise, and to protect it from the fevered urban visions of apartheid planners and neoliberal post-apartheid gentrifiers alike. The result is a museum that both preserved the memories of formerly displaced residents and continued to press for their “right of return” and restitution. The memory activists of District Six have demonstrated that colonial-style monuments have limited meanings and longevity in current contexts; they have instead enacted a more inclusive, fluid, and even ephemeral approach to memory work that can be a powerful tool for building communities and inspiring their agency.⁹

Nevertheless, Frisch offered a cautionary note in his call for more publicly engaged historical work. History and memory could be at odds, Frisch warned; that is to say, “official” history and people’s actual experience might render remarkably divergent stories. And, it goes without saying, many expressions of history in the “public sphere” ratify hegemonic rather than oppositional views; not all public history is people’s history, as Inge Dornan and Hannah Whittaker’s article in this issue poignantly suggests. In such a situation, Frisch maintained, repairing that gap “needs to be a major goal of a public history concerned with how a sense of the past might enhance our ability to imagine and create a different future.” How, Frisch asks, might public history help to restore memory and pierce the “curtain of amnesia” that veils all too much of what passes for history among the “public”?¹⁰ Some monuments, of course, merely drop that curtain anew.

In the decades since 1981 there has been a veritable explosion of public history, which by now has claimed its rightful place as a significant subfield of the historical discipline. At the same time, historians have become much more attentive to

the essential—and contested—role of memory in historical consciousness, practice, and narrative. Oral, local, and public historians, as well as museum professionals, have also become increasingly sensitive to the fallibilities of human memory. When, for example, does a people's community history substitute nostalgia, longing, and romanticization for accurate depictions of the lived social conditions of the past? One could point to the pioneering oral histories of scholars such as Frisch or Alessandro Portelli that treat personal historical narrative as memory texts that need the same kind of critical examination as any other source.¹¹ Rich critical scholarship on the history and practice of museums, monuments, and other memorial sites followed, as elites, cultural brokers, and the state sought to (re)organize historical knowledge and fashion historical memory to fit their own agendas. *RHR* has contributed a great deal to this corpus, publishing numerous articles devoted to such subjects as well as a pair of edited volumes in Duke's "Radical Perspectives" series designed to "examine how the sense of nation is represented in public history sites—museums, memorials, media, and the like."¹²

This issue brings this long-standing engagement with the politics of memory and public history forward to the present, sharing with readers some new and exciting scholarship in this area. As noted at the outset, the past decade has seen some dramatic examples of intertwined global memory activism. At the same time, however, the current wave of right-wing authoritarian populism, from Moscow to New Delhi, Budapest to Washington, and on to Jerusalem, only promises to further widen the gap between official history and more inclusive modes, even while the Left continues to topple old monuments from their pedestals—figuratively and literally. Still, with the worldwide resonance of BLM, contributions focused on the contentious histories of monuments to slavery, colonialism, and imperialism dominated the ninety-odd submissions we received for this issue. As a result, the impact of deeply conservative populist social movements and their authoritarian leaders remain, for the most part, a critical missing part of the contemporary debates over monuments and memoryscapes. In the aftermath of communism's collapse in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, widespread decommemoration practices soon emerged, exemplified by the removal of statues dedicated to once-revered Soviet figures. In Hungary, for instance, postcommunist authorities removed over forty communist-era statues and monuments from public spaces in Budapest, relocating them to an open-air museum on the city's outskirts. But the relocation was not the end of the story: Viktor Orbán's authoritarian-populist regime soon after abolished the national holiday celebrating the day of liberation of Hungary from fascism in 1945 by the Red Army. Orbán then set about erecting his own monument to Fidesz, his ultranationalist party, as the "true" liberator of Hungary from the weight of the past; in 2002, the grandiose House of Terror opened in Budapest with a seamless account of Hungarian totalitarianism from 1944 to 1990, conflating the fascist and Soviet periods. So, while the essays in this issue offer an important continuation of

abiding work on the politics of memorials, monuments, and memory activism, they are hardly the last word.¹³

Here, we offer three ways in which these essays build on the prior histories of erecting, reworking, and knocking down monuments in the past in order to provide a fresh framework for the field. First, several of the essays reimagine memorial forms entirely. Quilts, a Japanese garden, a dance performance, a light show, and walking tours memorialize intangible heritage in areas with histories marked and unmarked, seen and unseen, without signage, yet imbued with imagination and a sense of place curated by memorialists. Statuary memorials cast primarily in durable materials can exist or be recreated as sewn fabric, light projection, embodied movement, and in spaces with resonant but hidden histories. Second, these new forms disavow the hermetic, heroic—and, dare we say, masculinist—narratives, inviting discussion and complexity. Monuments and the heritage they speak to are open-ended sites for interrogation of the past (and, in so doing, of the future). Importantly, visitors can find room to question the narrative implied or offered, and then add to or modify it. Third, the essays contribute to the emerging field of memory activism. Memory activism has recently become a powerful theme of current thinking about monuments, as it joins the politics of historical memory with new forms of social activism aimed at challenging monuments in the public sphere. “We are currently witnessing the ‘activist turn’ in memory studies,” Yifat Gutman and Jenny Wüstenberg point out in their introduction to the recent *Routledge Handbook of Memory Activism*, a volume that brings together much representative work in this area. “Scholars, policymakers, and citizens have recently begun to take notice of their extraordinary power to effect mnemonic change” and thus to “build alternative sites of remembering, work to support existing commemorative institutions, and more.” In her own work on efforts to inject the memories of the Nakba into the public sphere in Israel/Palestine, Gutman defines memory activism as “the strategic commemoration of a contested past outside state channels to influence public debate and practice.” In the effort to produce “countermemory,” Gutman observes, “memory activists use memory practices and cultural repertoires as means for political ends, often (but not always) in the service of reconciliation and democratic politics.”¹⁴ Many of the essays in this issue of *RHR* highlight the role of local communities—of both the Left and the Right—that animate guerrilla memorials, counter-memorials, or ephemeral interventions in monumental areas. One result, as in graffiti seen on signage in Holocaust sites in Ukraine, a video installation cast on a monument to the “founders” of colonial Brazil, and on a Glasgow walking tour, is to see monuments as multilayered and ever subject to changing community engagements.

This seems like an opportune moment to revisit the important place of memory activism in pressing forward a more radical public history. About half of the articles in *RHR* 25 critically addressed “ruling-class renderings of the past,” especially

as presented in mass and popular culture.¹⁵ But the other half focused attention on “community-based history,” often flowing from creative collaboration between radicals inside the academy and activists beyond its gates—a collaboration reprised today by memory activists. Yet, as Ann Rigney observes in her contribution to the *Routledge Handbook*, for reclaimed memories to “catch hold,” hegemonic memories must be displaced before new ones can find expression. “While memory activism primarily takes a positive form,” Rigney notes, “it is also implicitly ‘against’ prevailing narratives which are considered unfit for purpose in a society with aspirations to greater justice and inclusivity.”¹⁶ To put it in blunter, material terms: before we can erect new monuments, old ones will have to be torn down—hence the term “fallism,” as coined by the most recent wave of South African memory activists. The articles in this issue seek to conjoin these two approaches, paying attention to the ongoing struggle between the sustained and powerful imposition of received ruling-class historical narratives and diverse organized efforts to visibly contest those narratives in the public sphere.

The seven articles, the two more personal “Interventions,” and the “Teaching Radical History” contribution found in this issue offer a wide range of approaches to this dialectic. At least two of them (Pinheiro Dias and Sá; Moody) suggest that it may be possible to use creative aesthetic forms to at least temporarily cast new meanings on old memorial sites or structures. As Rigney suggests, “ephemeral and performative interventions in public space are currently being developed as creative alternatives to the monumental.”¹⁷ Others (Brennan and Stevenson; Payton; Dorman and Whittaker) consider how the contested meanings of long-standing monuments in places as far-flung as Oceania, Haiti, and England’s home counties can ebb and flow with shifts in popular and political culture, both gradual and sudden. No matter how fixed in stone a monument may seem, no matter how reified its place in a nation’s memorial culture may appear, these apparently indelible physical markers of historical memory are in fact remarkably malleable, it seems. As two other contributions suggest (Suiama; Nickell), such pliability extends to how memorial sites are integrated into local memoryscapes, whether in the urban topography of Rio de Janeiro or Kiev, or the countryside of Transnistria, Ukraine.

The issue is organized into several sections focused topically rather than geographically or chronologically. The seven articles appear under three headings. The first, “Indigenous Memories,” suggests how Indigenous activists and their allies in Brazil, Australia, and Aotearoa/New Zealand have challenged monuments to colonial “heroes” long past their sell-by date. In the first, Lúcia Sá and Jamille Pinheiro Dias examine the Indigenous Brazilian artist Denilson Baniwa’s artistic reinvention of São Paulo’s infamous Monument to the Bandeiras. Set at the entrance to the city’s largest park, this massive granite sculpture uncritically celebrates a colonial history rife with the enslavement and murder of Brazil’s Indigenous population. In Baniwa’s hands, however, the monument was transfigured (albeit temporarily) into a

meditation on the traumatic encounter with racism and colonialism experienced by Brazil's original inhabitants. The second article in this section, by Claire Brennan and Ana Stevenson, describes what they call the "polite decommissioning" (permanent, in this instance) of a pair of commercialized statues representing the ubiquitous Captain James Cook. The explorer, long revered by white people in Australia and New Zealand, has not surprisingly been less popular among the Aboriginal and Māori First Nations living there long before Europeans arrived to dispossess and subjugate them.

The following section turns attention to the question of how best to remember slavery in the Americas and to commemorate the legacy of the Afro-Atlantic slave trade. Sergio Gardenghi Suíama documents the struggles of Afro-Brazilians living in a Rio de Janeiro neighborhood to shape the local memoryscape around Valongo Wharf, the largest disembarkation point for enslaved Africans in all of the Americas. Suíama finds a tension between efforts at commemoration designed to advance racial justice and those oriented to tourism, gentrification, and the commodification of Afro-Brazilian identity, culture, and history. A very different dynamic has played out in twentieth-century Haiti around the famous commemorative sculpture *Le Marron Inconnu* (The Unknown Maroon) in the center of Port-au-Prince. A global symbol of slave rebellion, the Haitian Revolution, and Black sovereignty, the *Marron Inconnu* has had multiple meanings within the contentious politics of Haiti itself. In her article, Claire Payton traces the history of this sculpture to lay bare the contradiction between Haiti's national ideals of Black freedom, rooted in its revolutionary legacy, and the nation's painful history of internal political oppression and external occupation. In contrast, looking to the metropole, Jessica Moody discusses a novel intervention by memory activists in Bristol, a major commercial hub of Britain's involvement in the slave trade (and, of course, once the site of the maligned statue of the slave trader Edward Colston). Even with Colston sent to the bottom of Bristol Harbor by BLM activists, Moody shows, an inventive coalition of artists, academics, and community members staged an embodied performance that deployed dance, movement, and creativity to highlight different kinds of knowledge about Bristol's entanglement with the Atlantic slave trade and its legacy.

The third and final pair of articles interrogate the intersection of memorialization and historical atrocities, in one case the Holocaust and in the other a colonial massacre in late nineteenth-century southern Africa. In "Unleashing the Lion's Roar," Inge Dornan and Hannah Whittaker describe a conservative "grass-roots counter-campaign" to redeem the legacy of British imperialism by protecting from removal the statue of Captain Charles Lendy (1863–94), a fallen soldier for the British South African Company who massacred Africans in Matabeleland (today's Zimbabwe) in the 1890s. In "From Babyn Yar to Bohdanivka," Amber Nickell contrasts two very different Holocaust memorial landscapes in the "Bloodlands" of Ukraine. One, on the outskirts of Kiev, remains one of the best-known sites

commemorating Nazi atrocities against Jews in the former Soviet Union; the other, in rural Transnistria, while marked, is obscure and inaccessible. These contrasting sites of memory cast light on the contested history of Holocaust memorialization and anti-Semitism in the shifting Soviet and post-Soviet national landscape of Ukraine.

The two essays found in the “Interventions” section do something slightly different, melding personal accounts with memory activism embedded in expressive and mnemonic art projects revisiting moments of historical trauma. These essays illustrate how suppressed memories can be brought to light through the painstaking work of reconstruction as a physical act of crafting a personal and familial material object of testimony. In one instance, Susan Walker, a descendant of an Alabama slave-owning family, returns to Lowndes County, Alabama, to recount how local African American women in the tiny hamlet of Mt. Willing sew the names of the enslaved into the quilts they make meticulously by hand. In the other, Jane Komori recalls how her grandfather, a Japanese Canadian citizen incarcerated in an internment camp during World War II, subsequently labored to construct Japanese rock gardens to memorialize this painful experience and explore his own dual identity as Japanese and Canadian.

Finally, in “Teaching Radical History” we take the somewhat unorthodox step of *not* providing a syllabus or describing a university classroom experience. Instead, the pedagogy of memory described by Rosemary Spooner takes place in public and follows the author on a “critical walking tour” of Kelvingrove Park in Glasgow. Through the pedagogy of walking, Spooner shows, a park that appears merely to be a bucolic respite from the hustle and bustle of industrial and commercial Glasgow is in fact deeply embedded in that city’s imperial history and implicated in the slave economy of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Atlantic world. Those who join Spooner on the tour she describes learn this history as it is made visible to them during the course of a two-hour meander through this city park.

Memory and the many forms it can take has always been deeply associated with orality, its primary means of transmission across nearly all cultures. Few scholars did as much to legitimize the study of orality and the mnemonic as elemental aspects of historical research and understanding than the renowned oral historian Ronald J. Grele (1934–2023). Appropriately enough, this issue, dedicated as it is to struggles over memory and forgetting, closes with a remembrance of Grele’s life and contributions to radical scholarship by the longtime *RHR* collective member Andor Skotnes.

Bonita Bennett is an independent museum practitioner and memory studies scholar, affiliated to the District Six Museum as a research associate. Recent work includes the article “Uncast in Stone: Inspired by Absence to Build a Solid Museum Practice” in the *International Journal of Intangible Heritage*, and cocuration of an exhibition in Cape Town, “Wear and Tear: On the Fabric and Fabrication of Freedom,” which reflects on thirty years of South Africa’s democracy (1994–2024).

Bonny Ibhawoh is professor and the Senator William McMaster Chair in Global Human Rights at McMaster University. He is the founding director of the McMaster Centre for Human Rights and Restorative Justice and coordinates the Confronting Atrocity Project, a transnational study of truth and reconciliation processes. He is author of *Imperial Justice* (2013) and *Imperialism and Human Rights* (2007) and coeditor of *Truth Commissions and State Building* (2023).

Alex Lichtenstein is professor of history and American studies at Indiana University. Recent works include *Margaret Bourke-White and the Dawn of Apartheid* (2016, with Rick Halpern), based on a photography exhibit curated at Indiana University and in South Africa; and *Marked, Unmarked, Remembered: A Geography of American Memory* (2017), a collaboration with his brother, the photojournalist Andrew Lichtenstein. He is cocurator of a traveling exhibit, "Unmasked: Anti-lynching Art and Community Remembrance."

Daniel J. Walkowitz is professor of history emeritus and professor of social and cultural analysis emeritus at New York University. A labor, urban, and public historian, his most recent books are *A Cultural History of Work in the Modern Age* (2019) and *The Remembered and Forgotten Jewish World: Jewish Heritage in Europe and the United States* (2018).

Notes

1. Taylor, *From #Blacklivesmatter to Black Liberation*; Nyamnjoh, *#RhodesMustFall*; Chantiluke, Kwoba, and Nkopo, *Rhodes Must Fall*; Cox, *No Common Ground*.
2. "About the Wall," Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, <https://www.vvmf.org/About-The-Wall/> (accessed September 18, 2024); Hass, *Carried to the Wall*.
3. Linenthal and Engelhardt, *History Wars*; Bess, *Choices under Fire*.
4. Young, *Stages of Memory*.
5. Gensburger and Wüstenberg, *De-commemoration*.
6. Benson et al., "Editors' Introduction," 4.
7. Frisch, "Memory of History," 9.
8. Indyk-Lopez, *Judith F. Baca*, 1; District Six Museum, *Reflections on the Conference*.
9. District Six Museum, *Reflections on the Conference*.
10. Frisch, "Memory of History," 14.
11. Frisch, *Shared Authority*; Portelli, *Death of Luigi Trastulli*.
12. Walkowitz, "Series in Public History," 79; Walkowitz and Knauer, *Memory and the Impact of Political Transformation*; Walkowitz and Knauer, *Contested Histories in Public Space*.
13. Walkowitz, *Remembered and Forgotten Jewish World*, 179–83.
14. Gutman and Wüstenberg, *Routledge Handbook of Memory Activism*, 5; Gutman, *Memory Activism*, 1–2.
15. Benson et al., "Editors' Introduction," 6.
16. Rigney, "Decommissioning Monuments, Mobilizing Materialities," 21.
17. Rigney, "Decommissioning Monuments, Mobilizing Materialities," 22.

References

- Benson, Susan Porter, Steve Brier, Robert Entenmann, Warren Goldstein, and Roy Rosenzweig. "Editors' Introduction." *Radical History Review*, no. 25 (1981): 3–8.
- Bess, Michael. *Choices under Fire: Moral Dimensions of World War II*. New York: Vintage, 2008.

- Chantiluke, Roseanne, Brian Kwoba, and Athinangamso Nkopo, eds. *Rhodes Must Fall: The Struggle to Decolonise the Racist Heart of Empire*. London: Zed Books, 2018.
- Cox, Karen L. *No Common Ground: Confederate Monuments and the Ongoing Fight for Racial Justice*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2021.
- District Six Museum. *Reflections on the Conference, Hands on District Six: Landscapes of Postcolonial Memorialisation*. Cape Town: District Six Museum, 2007.
- Frisch, Michael H. "The Memory of History." *Radical History Review*, no. 25 (1981): 9–23.
- Frisch, Michael H. *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.
- Gensburger, Sarah, and Jenny Wüstenberg, eds. *De-commemoration: Removing Statues and Renaming Places*. New York: Berghahn, 2023.
- Gutman, Yifat. *Memory Activism: Reimagining the Past for the Future in Israel-Palestine*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2017.
- Gutman, Yifat, and Jenny Wüstenberg, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Memory Activism*. New York: Routledge, 2023.
- Hass, Kristin Ann. *Carried to the Wall: American Memory and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Indych-Lopez, Anna. *Judith F. Baca*. Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Resource Center, 2018.
- Linenthal, Edward T., and Tom Engelhardt, eds. *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past*. New York: Holt, 1996.
- Nyamnjoh, Francis B. *#RhodesMustFall: Nibbling at Resilient Colonialism in South Africa*. Bamenda, Cameroon: Langaa Research and Publishing, 2016.
- Portelli, Alessandro. *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Rigney, Ann. "Decommissioning Monuments, Mobilizing Materialities." In Gutman and Wüstenberg, *The Routledge Handbook of Memory Activism*, 21–27.
- Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahtta. *From #Blacklivesmatter to Black Liberation*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021.
- Walkowitz, Daniel J. *The Remembered and Forgotten Jewish World: Jewish Heritage in Europe and the United States*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2018.
- Walkowitz, Daniel J. "Series in Public History 'Around the Globe.'" *Radical History Review*, no. 75 (1999): 79.
- Walkowitz, Daniel J., and Lisa Maya Knauer, eds. *Contested Histories in Public Space: Memory, Race, and Nation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.
- Walkowitz, Daniel J., and Lisa Maya Knauer, eds. *Memory and the Impact of Political Transformation in Public Space*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Young, James E. *The Stages of Memory: Reflections on Memorial Art, Loss, and the Spaces Between*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016.